

one of Masahiro et al. (JP 8-277139) or Paine et al (UK 2101762). The applicant respectfully traverses this rejection and argues that the current invention, as recited in claims 1-10, is neither anticipated nor made obvious by either of these references, either alone or in combination. The applicant would like to point out the following distinctions.

Masahiro et al. (JP 8-277139) discloses a method of monitoring and twisting an optical fiber including the step of monitoring an outer diameter in two different portions along the longitudinal direction of the optical fiber. In contrast, the present invention, as recited in claims 1-10, specifies that a method of measuring an outer diameter of an optical fiber along a longitudinal direction of the optical fiber is from two different directions in a plane perpendicular to the longitudinal direction of the fiber. According to this feature of the present invention, since two outer diameter measuring devices (C and D) are used in a device for measuring twisting, and the outer diameter of the optical fiber is measured from two different directions in a plane perpendicular to the advancing direction (longitudinal direction) of the optical fiber, it is possible to compare the result of the measurement from the device C with the result from the measuring device D in a quick and easy manner. Therefore, an actual twisting state can be accurately recognized and calculated by the simple control means. Thus, where Masahiro requires that a time lag caused by a length L (distance of two outer diameter measuring devices (20, 22)) be corrected, the present invention does not require any such time lag correction. To sum up, as pointed out above, Masahiro does not teach or suggest the

idea that an outer diameter of an optical fiber is measured along a longitudinal direction of the fiber from two different directions in a plane perpendicular to the longitudinal direction of the fiber.

Payne et al. (UK 2101762) discloses the step of measuring a diameter of the drawn fiber by measuring means (16). However, Payne et al. does not describe or suggest a specific method of measuring an outer diameter of an optical fiber in the specification. Based on the lack of specific description in Payne's invention, Applicant respectfully argues that based on the description in Payne (or lack thereof), particularly on page 3 of the specification, one skilled in the art would not understand from the reference to arrows (15) and single measuring means (16) in the FIG. 1 that the method of measuring an outer diameter along a longitudinal direction of the fiber must be from two different directions in a plane perpendicular to the longitudinal direction of the fiber. There is simply no suggestion or description of such measuring method in the specification of the Payne et al. reference.

In view of the foregoing, the applicant submits that the present invention, as recited in the amended claims, is neither anticipated nor rendered obvious by the cited prior art references. Entry of this amendment and an early favorable action on the merits are respectfully requested. Should any questions arise concerning this Amendment & Response, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned attorney for the applicant.

RECEIVED  
JUN 24 2003  
TC 1700

**CERTIFICATE OF MAILING**

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail under 37 C.F.R. 1.8 in an envelope addressed to:

Assistant Commissioner for Patents, United States Patent and Trademark Office, Washington, D.C. 20231.

DATE: June 18, 2003

NAME: Daniel Basov

SIGNATURE: Daniel Basov

Respectfully submitted,

By Daniel Basov  
Daniel Basov, Esq.  
Reg. # 42,303  
Chadbourn & Parke LLP  
30 Rockefeller Plaza  
New York, New York 10112  
(212) 408-5275

Attorneys for Applicant

June 18, 2003